



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,744	01/13/2004	Morton D Swimmer	CH920020012US1	1837
7590 11/07/2008				
IBM CORPORATION				
Anne Vachon Dougherty, Esq.				
3173 Cedar Road				
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598				
EXAMINER				
ALMEIDA, DEVIN E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2432				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/07/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/756,744

Applicant(s)

SWIMMER ET AL.

Examiner

DEVIN ALMEIDA

Art Unit

2432

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 5, 12-16 and 19-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, 5, 12-16 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the papers filed 7/21/2008.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 7/21/2008, with respect to claims 1, 15 and 16 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoefelmeyer et al (U.S. Patent 7,043,757) in view of Carmona et al (U.S. 7,260,725) in view of Kephart et al (U.S. Patent # 6,016,546).

Hoefelmeyer teaches with respect to claims 12, a method for preventing attacks in a monitored data processing system comprising the steps of: detecting an intrusion into the data processing system (see Hoefelmeyer column 6 lines 25-35); upon detection of an intrusion, identifying a malicious code string related to the detected intrusion (see Hoefelmeyer column 6 lines 25-35 i.e. viruses are detected by the detection manager system); extracting the malicious code string (see column 6 lines 25-

35); extracting the malicious code string (see Hoefelmeyer column 6 lines 25-35); storing each malicious code string extracted in a database of the response server (see Hoefelmeyer column 6 lines 25-43); forwarding the malicious code string to an intrusion limitation subsystem to reduce further intrusions based on the malicious code string (see Hoefelmeyer column 6 lines 25-43 i.e. upon detection of a new virus the detection manager system transmits the new signature to the remote site scanning system), wherein the intrusion limitation subsystem comprises a response server (see Hoefelmeyer column 6 lines 25-35 i.e. detection manager system) and wherein said response server distributes the malicious code string to one or more connected systems (see Hoefelmeyer column 6 lines 25-35 i.e. detection manager system transmits the new signatures to the remote site scanning system) to reduce further intrusions into such connected systems based on the malicious code string (see Hoefelmeyer column 6 lines 25-35)

Hoefelmeyer does not teach monitoring system calls, correlating the stored malicious code strings to find sets of malicious code; and for each set, generating a signature that allows the individual identification of all malicious code strings contained in the corresponding set.

Carmona teaches virus scanning by monitoring system calls (see column 4 lines 37-57) It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have also monitoring system calls to increase the effectiveness of the virus scanner (see column 4

lines 37-57). Therefore one would have been motivated to have monitoring system calls.

Kephart teaches correlating the stored malicious code strings to find sets of malicious code strings (see Kephart column 6 line 49 – column 7 line 28); and for each set, generating a signature that allows the individual identification of all malicious code strings contained in the corresponding set (see Kephart column 6 line 49 – column 7 line 28). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have grouped similar malicious code strings together to help reduce the amount of memory required to scan a given data string for the presence of computer viruses (see Kephart column 1 lines 56-65). Therefore one would have been motivated to have grouped similar malicious code strings together.

With respect to claim 4, wherein the one or more connected systems comprise one or more connected monitored systems (see Hoefelmeyer figure 2).

With respect to claim 5, wherein the one or more connected systems comprise one or more connected monitoring systems (see Hoefelmeyer figure 2).

Claims 13, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoefelmeyer et al (U.S. Patent 7,043,757) in view of Kephart et al (U.S. Patent # 6,016,546) in further view of Lamburt et al (U.S. Patent # 6,374,241).

Hoefelmeyer, and Kephart teach everything with respect to claim 12 above but with respect to claim 13 they do not teach wherein the correlating comprises utilizing an

edit-distance algorithm. Lamburt teaches wherein the correlating comprises utilizing an edit-distance algorithm (see Lamburt column 41 lines 4-62). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains to have used a edit-distance algorithm to how far apart two strings of data are. Therefore one would have been motivated to have grouped similar malicious code strings together using a edit-distance algorithm and group them based on a distance smaller than a given distance apart (see Lamburt column 41 lines 4-62).

With respect to claim 14, wherein the sets have mutual edit distances smaller than a given threshold distance (see Lamburt column 41 lines 4-62).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, 15, 16, 19-21 allowed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Devin Almeida whose telephone number is 571-270-1018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays from 7:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron, can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Devin Almeida/
Examiner, Art Unit 2132
10/21/2008

/Gilberto Barron Jr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2432